REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action of July 10, 2008. With this response claims 1 and 32 are amended and all pending claims 1, 3-32 and 34-56 are presented for reconsideration and favorable action.

In the Office Action, the claims continue to be rejected based upon the Eryurek reference (US 6,017,143). The Office Action took official notice that, "utilizing multiple separate sensors to provide for multiple process variables was well known at the time the invention was made in the analogous art of data acquisition." The Office Action further stated that, "at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use a process variable sensor separate from the vibration sensor." However, there is no support for this position and it is counterintuitive to the teaching of Eyrurek.

The claims have been amended to clarify that the sensed vibrations are used solely for performing diagnostics. This is in contrast to the vibration sensor mentioned in the Eryurek reference which is used to sense process variables. For this reason, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Further, Applicant would like to reiterate the point that Eryurek is attempting to perform diagnostics using the same sensor which is used to sense a process variable. There is no teaching in Eryurek to use a separate vibration sensor, placed within the process device, for use in performing diagnostics. For this additional reason the rejection should be withdrawn.

Applicant also notes a number of dependent claims which are clearly not shown by Eryurek. For example, claims 16 and 43 describe the use of a accumulation of sensed vibrations. The cited section of Eryurek (Col. 12, lines 31-37) describes training but does not describe accumulation. Similarly, claims 17 and 44 describes comparing the accumulated vibrations to a threshold. This also is not shown in the cited passage of Eryurek. Claims 19 and 46 describes adjusting a control algorithm based upon the diagnostic output. The cited section of Eryurek simply talks about a control signal but does not talk about using a diagnostic output to adjust a control algorithm. Claims 20 and 47 describe compensating a process variable based upon the diagnostic output. This also is not shown in Eryurek. The cited section of Eryurek does

describe compensating a process variable and such a function is typically performed to address non-linearities or other irregularities in a process variable sensor. However, the cited section of Eryurek (col. 4, lines 5-9) does not describe compensating a process variable based upon a diagnostic output.

For these additional reasons, these dependent claims are patentably distinct from the Eryurek reference.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration and favorable action are respectfully requested.

The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTMAN, CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.

By: /Judson K. Champlin/

Judson K. Champlin, Reg. No. 34,797
900 Second Avenue South, Suite 1400
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3319
Phone: (612) 334-3222 Fax: (612) 334-3312

JKC:lrs